

available. Open Access version available at <http://ku.scholarworks.ku.edu/esp/acc/>. Citation: Emmett, A, Stratton, J; Peterson, A.T; Church-Duran, J; & Lorraine Haricombe. Accepted for publication December 2010, expected publication in Summer 2011, *Toward Open Access: it takes a village*; Library Administration, to be published by Taylor and Francis. (Later to be published as chapter in monograph.)

Toward Open Access : It Takes a “Village”

Abstract:

Academics and librarians have worked in tandem for many years to broaden access to the scholarship they create, scrutinize, collect, and consume. Recent developments have focused on campus faculty advocating for change by developing self-imposed open access policies. Such policy developments have occurred in an evolutionary process, the beginnings of which might be identified as the “serials crisis” peaking in the 1990’s, followed by the focus on efforts to examine and reform broken aspects of the system of scholarly communication, and most recently the feasibility of faculty-initiated open access policies on university campuses. This paper provides an analysis of one university’s ten year evolution to an open access policy focusing primarily on its advocates’ lessons learned and the library’s role in order to add the perspective of a public institution’s experience.

Ada Emmett
Scholarly Communications Librarian
Center for Digital Scholarship
University of Kansas Libraries
Watson Library, Rm. 450
1425 Jayhawk Blvd Rm.
Lawrence, Kansas, 66045-7544
Voice: (785) 864-8831 Fax: (785) 864-5311.
email: aemmett@ku.edu

John Stratton
Librarian for Business and Economics
University of Kansas Libraries
Watson Library, Rm. 350
1425 Jayhawk Blvd
Lawrence, Kansas, 66045-7544
Voice: (785) 864-8990 Fax: (785) 864-5311
email: jstratton@ku.edu

A. Townsend Peterson
University Distinguished Professor
Biodiversity Institute
University of Kansas
1345 Jayhawk Blvd.
Lawrence, Kansas,
email: town@ku.edu

Jennifer Church-Duran
Assistant Dean for User Services
University of Kansas Libraries
Anschutz Library
1301 Hoch Auditoria Drive
Lawrence, Kansas, 66045-7544
Voice: (785) 864-8920 Fax: (785) 864-5311
jchurch-duran@ku.edu

Lorraine J. Haricombe
Dean of Libraries
University of Kansas Libraries
Watson Library
1425 Jayhawk Blvd. Room 502
Lawrence, Kansas, 66045-7544
Voice: (785) 864-4711 Fax: (785) 864-5311
email: ljharic@ku.edu

Introduction: Breaking Ground

In February 2008, after Harvard University’s Faculty of Arts and Sciences passed an open access policy granting a license to the university to share their scholarly journal articles openly, a ripple effect was set in motion. Faculty on university campuses around the United States began discussing whether adoption of an open access policy would meet their needs, and then considering the path they would take if the passage of a policy seemed correct. Open access advocates and activists saw Harvard faculty’s policy as a harbinger of acceptance of a new access model, one that would give the public direct access to the intellectual content produced by scholars. Among those applauding the Harvard policy were University of Kansas academics and librarians, who had for years been engaged in deliberations about the traditional dissemination of scholarly communications and its inherent disadvantages to scholars and institutions. These individuals quickly saw an opportunity to put into practice newer, complementary, and parallel methods of dissemination of scholarly information.

In April 2009, the KU Faculty Senate passed an Open Access policy (see Appendix A). The KU policy was similar to those passed earlier by faculty at Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), and Stanford University. With the passage of its policy, the KU faculty joined the ranks of faculty at private universities to initiate a self-imposed mandate making its scholarly journal articles publicly available. In a second vote of the KU Faculty Senate, in February 2010, the policy was further revised and re-approved, thus becoming the first comprehensive, public research institution in the United States to pass a university-wide policy of this kind—twice.

Why would university faculty consider an open access policy? What does such a policy accomplish? What does it intend to do? In general, policies such as those passed by the faculty at Harvard, MIT, and KU attempt to solve, or at least minimize, problems of ever-narrowing access to scholarly literature by focusing on open and public access to scholarly peer-reviewed journal articles. Faculty interested in the access problem ask themselves, “how do we faculty at this institution provide the widest possible access to our work? Is there power in collective action, in a collective voice?”

The purposes of this paper are twofold: first, to provide a brief history of KU’s ten-year odyssey of examining scholarly communication issues, culminating in passage of a faculty open access policy. The KU faculty’s multi-year, “it takes a village,” approach to an open access policy will be discussed. A second goal is to offer “lessons learned” by faculty advocates regarding practical insights for those either already engaged in creating, or contemplating the creation of, such a policy on their campuses. It is the authors’ hope that the practical experiences described here by KU faculty advocates may provide useful information for other institutions that are also approaching these issues and that the lessons learned from the KU experience may be generalized and applied where appropriate in principle if not in detail, at other campuses.

The experiences at Harvard, MIT, Stanford, and KU have made quite clear that practical aspects of creating change in the understanding and behavior of academics related to creation of open access policies are complex. Stated another way, gaining consensus on the theoretical and philosophical underpinnings for the open access movement and the pragmatic requirements of practicing open access are two different and necessary processes. Both views are critical, but the authors’ intentions are to focus on the more pragmatic aspects.

The work of fostering an environment on campus in which interest in open access in principle can move to a concrete willingness to take collective action is not easy. Making “vision” a reality is rife with

challenges and opportunities for those on the front-lines, and these particular aspects of policy creation and implementation have not yet been fully explored in the literature of open access. The experiences gained by those local campus advocates who are directly engaged in the cultural, sociological and psychological aspects of social change may be proven to be of significant value to others who may be contemplating similar policy creation or related initiatives.

A Brief History of KU’s Journey to Open Access

KU has long history of faculty interest and advocacy for public/open access to the products of scholarship. Looking back over the decade preceding the actual open access vote in the Faculty Senate, a distinct progression of activities related to improving scholarly communications and seeking ways to expand access to academic scholarship can be noted.

1998-2008 -- Scholarly Communication Reform

Years before the international attention garnered by the 2002 Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI), KU was already engaged in proactive dialogues concerning scholarly communication. This journey began in 1998, when KU’s then-Provost David Shulenburg presented at the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Membership Meeting in Washington D.C. His speech, titled *Moving with Dispatch to Resolve the Scholarly Communication Crisis: From Here to NEAR*, advocated for direct and immediate actions to address the growing scholarly communication crisis. At its heart was the idea of a *National Electronic Article Repository (NEAR)* and the desire to ensure “the ultimate right of the academy to inexpensive and open access to the scholarly communication it generates” (Shulenburg, 1998)ⁱ. This speech propelled KU onto the national scene as a leader in the growing conversation about scholarly communication reform.

In 2000, Shulenburg’s participation at a national meeting in Tempe, Arizona further strengthened KU’s leadership role. Sponsored by the Association of American Universities, the ARL and KU’s Merrill Advanced Studies Center, this meeting facilitated conversation among multiple academic stakeholders about the scholarly publishing process. Its goal was to “build consensus on a set of principles that could guide the transformation of the scholarly publishing system” (Case, 2000)ⁱⁱ. The resulting “Tempe Principles” carried with them dedication to local initiatives designed to move institutions of higher education towards the provision of access to all “relevant published research across all disciplines to all faculty by way of systems that ensure dependable management and affordable access to information over time” (Case, 2000).ⁱⁱⁱ

Shulenburg quickly brought the philosophy behind the Tempe Principles back to the state of Kansas, hosting in 2000 the first of two Provost’s Seminars, “From Crisis to Reform: Scholarly Communication and the Tempe Principles,” involving national speakers on key topics. From there, over the next eight years, additional faculty seminars, conferences and other key events were sponsored by various bodies on the campuses of KU, Kansas State University and KU Medical Center.

As a critical part of this local effort, KU established a pilot institutional repository, *KU ScholarWorks*, in the spring of 2003. During the initial test phase, significant effort was made to encourage early adopters to use the repository. Led by KU Libraries’ then-Assistant Dean, Richard Fyffe, this stage required substantial outreach and educational efforts campus-wide. KU library faculty, administrators, and staff

worked tirelessly to “reach out to faculty, solicit their material, and further engage them in applying alternative methods to disseminate their research (Mercer et al, 2007)^{iv} .”

In March 2005, KU was the first member of the American Association of Universities (AAU) to pass a resolution to encourage self-archiving by its faculty (Suber, 2005)^v. Titled “Resolution on Access to Scholarly Information,” it was passed by the KU University Council, at that time the governance body for faculty and professional and academic staff of the University. The approval of this resolution coincided both with a second Provost’s Seminar on Scholarly Communication held in early March 2005, and with the official launch of the *KU ScholarWorks* repository (Mercer et al., 2007)^{vi}.

2008- February 2010 present: -- Open Access Policy, Phases I and II

Although a significant achievement, the combination of KU’s “*Resolution on Access to Scholarly Information*” and its institutional repository resulted in a “somewhat labor intensive approach” to open access (Mercer et al, 2007)^{vii}. It relied heavily on building relationships, education, and outreach but lacked any larger sense of institutional urgency or faculty ownership. Despite active building and promotion, adoption among faculty was slow.

By 2008, the results of KU’s efforts mirrored a growing body of evidence that the “encouragement” or resolution approach to OPEN ACCESS does not necessarily result in substantial participation levels. In his work, “*Maximizing Research Impact through Institutional and National Open-Access Self-Archiving Mandates*,” Stevan Harnad notes that encouragement to deposit items “is not sufficient to raise the self-archiving rate appreciably above the 15% baseline for spontaneous self-archiving” (2006)^{viii}.

The original version of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Public Access Policy is a significant example of the limited efficacy of the voluntary option. Also passed in 2005, the NIH policy encouraged, but did not require, open access participation. Like KU, the agency took numerous routes to promote involvement, including education campaigns and outreach activities. However, these efforts still resulted in relatively low submission levels. NIH estimated that approximately 80,000 papers arise from NIH funds each year. During the period covered by the voluntary policy, (May 2005 to December 2007), NIH was able to collect only about 19% of these targeted papers, (National Institute of Health, 2008)^{ix}.

Unsatisfied with this outcome, Congress ordered the NIH to move to a mandatory approach in 2007. The updated policy requires that NIH-funded papers be accessible to the public on PubMed Central no later than 12 months after publication, and that evidence of compliance must be included in all NIH applications and reports. Even before final implementation of the new policy, compliance rates rose dramatically. Under the first five months of the new requirement (April to August 2008), this rate jumped to an estimated 56% of papers per month (National Institute of Health, 2008).

It was shortly after this drastic shift in the NIH policy that the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard University passed the first faculty open access policy in the United States. Both of these landmark events illustrated the promise of an open access requirement, and offered a new direction, one that acknowledged the importance of a strong mandate among authors themselves to achieve optimal results. This changing climate served as an important catalyst at KU.

Days after Harvard passed its new policy, a group of engaged KU faculty decided to pursue creation of a university-wide, faculty-initiated open access policy, similar to that of Harvard, with a faculty governance mandate that could propel KU beyond the current reach of the 2005 resolution.

Creation of the *Ad Hoc* Committee:

In late Spring 2008, KU’s Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FacEx) considered how best to introduce and frame the impetus for an open access policy, in a way that would reflect a true mandate coming from within the faculty governance system. Eventually, FacEx charged the Faculty Research Committee to develop a policy for consideration. It was ultimately decided to place responsibility for completing this charge with a subcommittee called the Open Access *Ad Hoc* Committee.

The committee’s charge for the 2008/2009 academic year was to:

Develop a policy designed to promote open access to KU scholarship. The policy would outline a process to collect, preserve, and disseminate scholarly articles of KU faculty through *KU ScholarWorks*. Recommended policies should be discussed by governance and the KU research community. Report recommendations to FacEx by February 16, 2009.

Members of the *ad hoc* committee were drawn from the Faculty Research Committee and an *ex-officio* member was selected from the Faculty Senate (a member of the library faculty). As members of the faculty, KU librarians have served and continue to serve, in key roles in the university and faculty governance bodies, and were active participants in this committee. It was clear from early in the process that to achieve any level of success would require vocal advocates. As noted in the SPARC & Science Commons White Paper, *Open Doors and Open Minds: What Faculty Authors Can do to Ensure Open Access to Their Work Through Their Institution*, a critical need exists for internal champions who are “willing to devote substantial time to building consensus among multiple stakeholders” (Think Nguyen et al., 2008^x). KU was fortunate to have strong advocates both within the Libraries and among the teaching faculty who were willing to participate, engage and educate their colleagues on the need for change.

During the fall and winter of 2008 and 2009, the *ad hoc* committee worked to draft the policy and propose an implementation process. While it was clear to the committee that a true mandate must exist for KU’s institutional repository, *KU ScholarWorks*, and open access efforts to expand, it was also apparent how provocative the word “mandatory” can be to the academic community. As a result, the committee focused on ways to build a shared vision and sense of value for the policy and generate understanding of the benefits to its passage. To eliminate any hint of coercion, the *ad hoc* committee took a proactive stance, creating multiple input and communication opportunities and advancing the open access message across campus.

Engaging the Faculty:

The *ad hoc* committee designed a systematic approach to opening the lines of communication across campus. As part of this effort, a web-based survey was distributed to faculty to assess attitudes and knowledge about open access, and to gauge faculty awareness of, and interest in, an open access policy on the KU campus. Two open meetings were also convened for the entire faculty and presentations were made to both FacEx and full faculty senate meetings. Faculty questions, concerns, or criticisms were regularly and quickly addressed by the *ad hoc* group. Some faculty attended sessions in person to voice concerns and raise questions, but more submitted comments via email. Many of the issues that

were raised turned out to be misunderstandings of basic points—what is open access, what does such a policy mean, and how would such a policy be implemented. The committee found that carefully worded responses were required, especially when such concerns were inaccurate or even accusatory in nature. In general, however, most faculty were neutral about the policy. That is, they appreciated and were supportive of the principles of open access but did not feel it necessary to comment or participate in discussions. A detailed analysis of the concerns and misunderstandings raised by some faculty during the policy development and refinement phases is presented later in the paper.

In February of 2009 Stanford professor John Willinsky led a globalization seminar at KU entitled “Open Access to Knowledge: What Comes of the Right to Know in Kansas and Kumasai” (Willinsky, 2009a)^{xi}. Both video presentations of Willinsky’s talks are available in KU’s open repository and are linked from the References section at the end of this article (see Willinsky, 2009a and b^{xii}). This seminar was timely in that it furthered discussions on the advantages, globally to open access, and provided the campus with access to another scholar’s approach to the access to scholarship problem.

As policy development continued among faculty senators, the implementation details drafted and circulated to faculty groups were proving polemical in senate leadership. A librarian member of FacEx felt that the policy itself could pass in the Faculty Senate if details of implementation were left out—as other schools had passed such policies without implementation details being included. This librarian worked with the *ad hoc* committee’s drafts and, at an April 2009 FacEx meeting, proposed a revised policy statement that did not include any procedural details.

A final revision of that proposal was offered to the Faculty Senate, outlining the heart of the policy and requiring that implementation and procedural details be presented to the Faculty Senate for approval during the following academic year. With the following proviso, the policy was passed overwhelmingly by the Faculty Senate in April 2009 and later approved by the KU Provost and Chancellor in May, 2009. The final sentence of the policy stated:

“Faculty governance in consultation with the Provost's office will develop the details of the policy which will be submitted for approval by the Faculty Senate.”

This policy implemented the two critical elements of open access: required deposit in an institutional archive and it created an automatic license that attaches to the work before transfer of copyright to the publisher. Similar to the Harvard and MIT policies, the KU policy lacked only a description of the mechanism by which a faculty member’s paper would be conveyed to the university repository. Although this mechanism would be important (and a gap closed the next year) the mandate was clear in the policy that the license to share its faculty’s work was granted to the university. Thus, by early 2009, KU had achieved a remarkable milestone by being the first U.S. public university whose faculty had approved a university-wide, comprehensive, open access policy. However, as noted above, the provision had been added to the policy that implementation details needed to be described and approved in the coming year as a second phase.

Task Force:

With that requirement in place, an implementation task force was formed in the summer of 2009, composed of faculty from a range of disciplines and ranks (including librarians), university administrators, and the representative of the Faculty Senate. To ensure the success, careful thought was given to the invitations issued for task force membership. Regardless of other background context, all members of the task force were strong supporters of open access, with many already practicing some

form of open and public sharing of their work or serving as activists for open access in their disciplines. Two were already editors and publishers of open access journals hosted by KU; one was a strong advocate for open access due to her work in a field where patients and patient’s families need better access to the research results. Another was a law faculty member with expertise in copyright and intellectual property who had researched the feasibility and outcomes of “open patents.”

Specific faculty were invited to serve because they had disciplinary or administrative experience to bring to the discussion as well as interest in some aspect of open access. University administrators, including the Interim Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, and an Assistant Dean of Libraries, along with a representative from the campus IT office, were all contributing members of the task force. Throughout the summer and into the fall of 2009, this task force worked tirelessly to consult and inform faculty across campus, seek guidance on policy revisions, and outline an implementation plan to meet its charge.

The implementation plan that began to unfold described processes that would be undertaken to carry out the terms of the policy. In an iterative and deliberative process that involved over 20 public meetings with over 230 faculty and administrators, questions and concerns were received and addressed. For example, in efforts to educate the campus community, the task force:

- Hosted six “brown bag” lunches with faculty; one open meeting for all faculty;
- Arranged meetings with many academic departments;
- Prepared and presented progress reports to FacEx, Faculty Senate, Vice Provosts/Deans’ “Academic Council,” and Graduate Student’s Professional Association on campus;
- Held extended discussions with the Information Technology Unit and the KU Libraries to clarify their roles and resources needed.

As the academic year progressed, the task force discussed and summarized input and prepared new drafts of the policy and implementation plan. “Early adopter” departments and individual faculty members were enlisted to test implementation ideas and processes and provide feedback to task force members..

A penultimate progress report and presentation were enthusiastically received by FacEx and the Faculty Senate in November 2009. In February 2010, the final drafts of the policy revision and the implementation outline were submitted to the Faculty Senate for formal consideration. After some debate on the floor, the policy was approved as submitted and the implementation document endorsed. See the revised policy in Appendix A. With this approval and endorsement, KU’s Open Access Policy, including implementation details, was submitted to the Provost and Chancellor for final approval, which came in March, 2010. The policy then took full effect.

The Open Access policy passed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the central administration was the product of a broad, collaborative effort by members of the KU faculty. The process took two full academic years and considerable investment of time and effort by members of the faculty and administration, including library faculty in leadership roles within University Governance, particularly the Faculty Senate and FacEx. A veritable academic village of faculty, administrators, librarians, governance leaders, advocates, and participants was necessary to make this policy a reality.

Post-Script: Reflections on Post-Policy Passage, Spring 2010 to present:

Since the final passage of the revised policy and endorsement of an implementation plan, the Libraries and key departments (‘early adopters’) have taken many careful and innovative steps to keep the momentum going and in fact, increasing. Below, the Libraries’ role since February 2010 is described and a case study of one early adopter department is developed. Less than one year into KU’s open access policy, clearly much work remains ahead.

The Libraries’ Role

Globally, academic libraries have always been responsible for procuring and making accessible the scholarly material they own. As an active open access partner, libraries will not only help universities demonstrate the depth and breadth of their own faculty’s scholarship, but they will also provide the widest possible audience and increase its potential impact nationally and globally.

Locally, the policy implementation document endorsed by KU’s Faculty Senate (2010) and approved by the Provost named the Dean of Libraries as the Provost’s Designate responsible for implementing KU’s Open Access policy. In this expanded role KU Libraries offers full service assistance to faculty from the moment an article is accepted to when it is uploaded into *KU ScholarWorks*, the final step in the process for faculty. Integrating open access materials into normal library operations requires additional staff, time, and effort. Towards that end, a new staff member was hired to assist in the roll-out and promotion of the services KU Libraries will provide to the campus community. Within the first months of the Libraries’ roll-out plan, a growing number of department chairs has expressed earnest interest in making their departments’ scholarly output openly accessible.

To be successful it has been imperative to provide professional development opportunities for librarian liaisons in their new roles as open access partners. At KU, librarians are encouraged to participate in open access activities and to embrace opportunities to participate in information literacy and educational opportunities on campus related to scholarly communications and open access. In effect, after passage of the KU Open Access policy, it will take a whole village of librarians and staff to fully support and encourage the implementation and adoption of new practices of open sharing. Subject librarians who liaise with departments need to grow in their understanding of the issues, and be of direct assistance to faculty: achieving this change is a long-term project. It is a process of nurturing faculty to embrace their stewardship over the access to the works they offer. It is also a long-term process to engage all librarians working with faculty so that are fully prepared to assist in the policy’s implementation.

Brian Rosenblum (2010)^{xiii} lists several ways that front-line librarians can assist to sustain open access practices and policies as well as other innovations in scholarly communication. Some of his examples include various means of advising faculty in their roles as instructors, authors, editors, publishers:

- Assisting with rights and permissions;
- Maintaining scholarly communication websites;
- Organizing workshops on copyright issues and digital scholarship;
- Advocating through university governance and administrative channels, to shape discussions of OA policies;
- Educating and training other librarians and students.
Providing training sessions and information to support early adopters in uploading their scholarly work in *KU ScholarWorks*.

The impact of KU’s open access policy on the Libraries has generated both exciting opportunities for meaningful partnerships. A pilot project with the Kansas University Press to digitize books in the public domain and the KU editors’ forum, hosted by the libraries, are examples of new central roles and expanded reach for KU Libraries. A call from the Dean of Libraries to all department chairs and deans of the schools and College to select an “open access liaison” to work with Library staff to build on the early adopter program has already had early success.

Notwithstanding significant progress in adopting open access policies and reshaping the scholarly communication process libraries will likely operate in a mixed open-access environment into the foreseeable future where open access venues and traditional publication models will co-exist (Schmidt, 2005)^{xiv}. At KU, the Libraries continue to work to build skills, expertise, organizational and funding models to sustain these partnerships and programs. KU Libraries remains optimistic about the global momentum of open access and commit to advancing broad access to KU’s scholarship now and into the future.

A Departmental Case Study: Ecology and Evolutionary Biology

With passage of a full open access policy at KU, the next challenge is that of “growing out” the idea. Discussed above is the Libraries’ role as the Provost’s Designate to implement this policy. The other side of the implementation “coin” however, is the issue of participation, and how it must be developed and nurtured. As discussed above, the fully voluntary model does not grow fast enough or completely enough.

Organismal biology as a field may be characterized by relatively “green” publishing policies—that is, many journals are at least amenable to access being opened by placement of copies of their articles in institutional repositories, although the number of fully open access *journals* remains relatively low (around 10-12%). Nevertheless, that “we have a problem” is indicated by the results of a recent informal survey in which 10 literature citations were sent to 50+ colleagues worldwide, to see who could obtain access to which citations. The results were quite simple—(1) no journal was universally accessible, with success rates ranging from 91% (*Systematic Biology*, *Molecular Biology and Evolution*) down to <45% (*Journal of Mammalogy*, *Review of Palaeobotany and Palynology*, *Herpetologica*); and (2) only 2 of 32 respondents (both in Europe) had access to all 10 publications. These results strongly suggest that the access problem is indeed a serious problem, with very real implications for readership of papers in this field.

The Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (“EEB”) at KU is a large (40+ faculty members) department firmly situated in the natural sciences. Notwithstanding a yearly production of 100-150 journal papers, EEB had nonetheless shown little interest in open access issues or KU’s institutional repository prior to 2009/2010, with only 31 papers posted by the end of 2008. In the past 2 years, however, open access activities and discussions at KU have awakened considerable interest among EEB faculty, and the current (1 November 2010) total is 227 papers online. Interestingly, these papers have seen an impressive amount of readership and download via KU’s institutional repository: 22,678 views or downloads since 2007, for an overall average of 46 views or downloads per paper per year online, with readers coming from a remarkable 126 countries.

These data, combined with a summary of 1211 EEB journal publications over the period 2001-2009, offer the basis for some initial calculations about EEB’s “Open access potential.” Basically, considering “green” status, as summarized in Sherpa/RoMEO (<http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/>), in which already-

published papers could be placed in the institutional repository without further negotiations with publishers regarding rights, 418 of the 1211 papers could be placed online essentially immediately, more than doubling the representation of EEB scholarship in the institutional repository. Based on publication patterns in 2001-2009, we anticipate 150 journal publications from EEB yearly, of which 50-60 could be placed in the repository on the basis of green publishing practices; we anticipate a further 20-30 papers per year can be added based on negotiated agreements with publishers under the KU Open Access policy. In the end, we calculate rather conservatively that EEB could have 1000 papers online by 2011, and 1600 papers online by 2020; the *yearly* reader/viewership would likely reach 50,000 by 2011 and 75,000 by 2020. The benefits to EEB in terms of increased citation and attention paid to its scholarship would be nothing short of transformative.

This case study illustrates the degree to which open access resources can be built relatively easily. Many departments around KU (and other universities) could reap similar rewards, were they to invest a modicum of attention and energy in building institutional repositories, and opening access to their scholarly production. Although these extrapolations are preliminary, they nonetheless serve to illustrate the point of how manageable the problem of access to journal-published scholarship actually is.

Lessons Learned and “Take Aways”:

As noted above, the second purpose of this paper is to offer “lessons learned” – specifically, those learned by faculty advocates at KU working together to pass an open access policy—and to provide “take aways,” or practical insights for those engaged in creating or contemplating development of such a policy for their campuses. Each academic institution has a unique culture, but the experience gained at KU, a public research university, may prove useful to other university advocates at similar institutions.

Several observations about the path leading from interest in an open access policy to passage of such a policy are offered at this juncture. Below, we present lessons learned from faculty’s responses and perspectives on open access, campus/institutional conditions and processes, and task force development and function. These observations are not intended to offer step-by-step procedures for creating an open access policy but rather a range of observations about the challenges faced and opportunities seized at KU.

Faculty Perspectives about Open Access:

The open access movement represents a political and social change process comprised of outreach, deliberations, information sharing, education, and negotiations, to identify and solve problems of limited public access to scholarship. Varying opinions ranging across the spectrum from acceptance to opposition can and should be expected during the course of deliberations. At KU, creation of an open access policy was best vested in the faculty but each campus possesses its own unique history and culture. A faculty-driven open access policy may not be the solution to the particular broad problems and opportunities present on other campuses. Faculty advocates at KU ultimately came to realize that open access policy passage and implementation is a journey, not an event. Once undertaken, the work represents a process, part of a cultural shift on individual campuses and KU’s work clearly has only just begun.

KU open access advocates found the majority of the faculty to be supportive of the basic principle of open access to scholarship. Whether a policy was the right choice, what a policy might say or require, and what its consequences would be, were separate questions. Much of the advocacy work involved addressing misunderstandings, alleviating concerns, and providing information to faculty. As a result of the work done at KU, faculty and librarians from other campuses around the country have asked about concerns that were raised at this institution and how they were addressed. As a result, the information provided below represents a sample of some of these faculty concerns, offered here as additional lessons learned during KU’s process.

In general, comments were received from faculty throughout the process. Although none was solidly opposed to basic open access principles, some expressed considerable confusion regarding important ideas related to open access. In particular, some did not like the idea of an open access *mandate*: that is, an actual or perceived *requirement* to participate in an open access policy. (It was quickly learned that words such as “mandate” and “compliance” are so unpleasant to faculty that faculty working on the policy dropped them from use.) Other misperceptions asked whether “open access” circumvented the peer review process or a traditional publication model, reflecting more than anything lack of information. On the other hand, some faculty wanted a policy with more “teeth,” such that the suite of concerns that had to be addressed was diverse and complex.

Many of the comments and questions were discipline-specific across KU. The following are four concerns that would likely rank as most frequently communicated regarding the open access policy at KU:

- **Time required** – All university faculty are likely overworked and time-stressed as far as meeting all of the diverse demands that are made of them. As a consequence, one very frequent concern was that the open access process would create a new reporting burden, in which major time costs would result from the publication process. Although the process of uploading a publication to *KU ScholarWorks* is minimally time-consuming (10-12 minutes maximum), to streamline the process still further, the process was reduced to that of emailing the paper to the appropriate library personnel for upload. With this change, the process is reduced to a simple email of the article version and metadata, taking no more than a minute or so.
- **Junior faculty and tenure** – An occasional concern expressed to the open access team was that of effects on preparations for tenure by junior faculty. Junior faculty were perceived as being particularly time-stressed, and additionally in need of publications as fast as possible, and without the complications of negotiations with publishers over copyrights. These concerns, however, are illusory—the time demands are minimal (see above), and we know of no case in which copyright negotiations with a publisher have led to rejection of a paper. Rather, at least in the sciences, an important consideration in the tenure process is the rate at which one’s work is cited in the broader literature, so the citation advantages that accrue to easily accessible papers work to the advantage of the junior faculty member.
- **Giving up rights** – Faculty often did not understand in detail the distinctions between transferring copyright and granting licenses. As a consequence, the task force heard from time to time the complaint that faculty were not happy with transferring their rights to KU—after all, “academic freedom” would suggest that they do not have to give up anything, even to their employer. In truth, of course, under the KU Open Access policy, no rights are “given up” to KU—the license that is granted to the university is non-exclusive, and simply allows the university to provide an open access version of the paper over the Internet. Rather, the KU Open Access policy offers distinct

advantages to faculty in *retaining* rights that would otherwise have had to be transferred to the publisher in a more absolute and exclusive copyright transfer agreement.

- **Small society journals** – Perhaps the most serious of faculty concerns about the KU Open Access policy was in terms of effects on small journals and the academic societies that at times depend on those journals as a major source of income. In some sense, this concern is real, in that such journals may be eventually affected by open access reducing subscribership, if such policies (whether via university or funding agencies) become ubiquitous. However, again this concern is founded in under-information. (1) Under the KU Open Access policy, journals have the last word, in that they can accept or reject a request for retention of rights by an author, and thereby control whether access to papers published are open or closed. (2) Small journals often are low-impact and/or seldom cited in the broader literature, and so can benefit greatly from the increased citation rates that accrue to papers that are more readily accessible to readers. Finally, (3) in the long run, as access barriers are lowered and journal subscription costs perhaps fall back to more reasonable sums, small society journals may be able to reap invaluable support from universities that have already allotted substantial funds to journal literature access.

In sum, presenting and vetting an open access policy to an academic community such as that of the University of Kansas has been a complex and demanding process. Debating skills, scholarly breadth, and knowledge of the publishing and informatics worlds are all necessary ingredients of a successful team. Indeed, to some extent, not all in such a community will end up content with such a bold step, placing a premium on good negotiation skills and salespersonship.

Campus/Institutional Conditions and Processes

There are campus and institutional conditions and processes that can foster development of a robust university-wide investigation of the benefits of an open access. The suggestions below pertain to strictly local environments; as with the broader approaches, it may be that many of these activities could occur simultaneously. As previously stated, at KU it was decided that creation of an open access policy was best commenced and finalized as a faculty initiative.

- Faculty who have become champions of open access principles in their disciplines (via open access journals, self-archives and other kinds of advocacy for open sharing of scholarship) can make excellent partners while the campus is in early stages of policy creation. During the process of policy creation itself, advocates at KU found it helpful to identify “early adopter” faculty and departments to test presentations and procedures, and build support.
- It may be advisable to conduct an environmental scan of the strengths present on a given campus that would tend to support advancements in open access efforts. These “assets” can be strengths in people, in funding, campus governance structures and mechanisms, or institutional history. Proponents of open access should seek opportunities to work directly with governance leaders if such leaders are familiar with and potentially open-minded regarding such initiatives.
- While not possible at all institutions, having an institutional repository, digital archive, or some other digital holding space prepared for use is helpful. At KU, the fact that an institutional repository had been in use helped illustrate that the university was poised to provide a mechanism by which to share the work openly, and had the technical and human resources to support its use. The repository can also supply usage and download statistics of those materials already being shared. In Harvard’s case, nonetheless, the lack of an institutional repository did not stop the faculty from unanimously supporting the passage of their open access policy.

- It may be that open access efforts will have their origin among the library faculty on a particular campus, especially since librarians are very much engaged in discussions about reform in the system of scholarly communication. Although librarians on many campuses are faculty (as at KU), other faculty sometimes believe the librarian perspective is biased. It does not help to encourage the old sentiment that “scholarly communication” efforts are purely an outgrowth of an older library challenge, sometimes referred to as the “serials crisis.” However, if librarians and faculty can partner in creating change on campus by working cooperatively on an open access policy, so much the better for both groups.
- Library administrative support is critical to the success of open access initiatives, especially where librarians are at the forefront of local efforts. At KU as on other campuses, strong library administrative support was present, but was most useful behind the scenes, offering to faculty open access and technical expertise.

Task Force Lessons

The formation of a task force (or working group or committee) to develop an open access policy is often a next step after significant campus discussions have taken place. Such a group can manage more focused discussion and be charged with specific actions that meet the needs and goals of that particular university. Several specific suggestions concerning the creation, staffing, and work of such a group are provided below.

- The careful choice of membership and framing of the charge are critical components to later success. At KU, when such a task force was formed, it was important that a specific charge, timeline, and clear and achievable goals were stated. Having a carefully selected group of faculty and administrators serving on the task force at KU was extremely helpful. Those task force members brought their disciplinary and administrative expertise to the discussions, thus allowing greater anticipation of and preparation for concerns that would be raised from other corners of the campus. (See Appendix B for KU’s Open Access Implementation Task Force Charge.) It is equally important that such an endeavor has upper-level campus administrative support from the beginning. For example, the Provost at KU was approached with the idea of forming such a task force early in the process, to gauge the level of support that could be expected from that office.
- Vesting the task force’s work within the faculty governance system proved to be advisable at KU. At the very least, such a body may be lead by a faculty member who possesses exceptional “people skills,” since such skills form the bedrock of the outreach-related work that will be undertaken by the group. In addition, task force leaders must possess an excellent grasp of the central open access issues and should be prepared to tailor their messages for specific audiences within the academic community. They should in essence, “play well with others,” and be receptive to hearing advice from other experts. A university-wide, provost-level committee is another option with its own advantages (less politicking at the governance level) and disadvantages (faculty acceptance of an administrative body considering rights management of its faculty’s work).

Suggestions about the work of the Open Access Task Force:

- While the task force will proceed at its own pace, it is generally advisable to proceed slowly, to allow time for faculty and administrators to have their questions addressed and concerns dispelled. During their work, the task force should consider planning informational meetings to

introduce open access concepts to interested parties on campus. In these meetings at KU, members of the task force remained open-minded about the opinions that were expressed and the revisions requested. Creation of draft policy or position papers, let alone procedural documents, was viewed as an iterative process, as faculty groups, individuals, and the task force members weighed new information. Further, revisions were made many times before final documents were shared with KU faculty governance for review.

- Depending on local circumstances, campus meetings may be held in informal forums, departmental meetings, meetings with deans and chairs, governance-sponsored venues, or in other appropriate sessions. Whenever possible, it is recommended that the task force meet with faculty in face-to-face venues. For example, KU’s brown-bag lunches and departmental meetings were quite successful, and resulted in very productive discussions. Such meetings served to lend a significant degree of credibility to the task force’s efforts, and provided additional legitimacy to the initiative, especially in the eyes of faculty governance and central administration. In all arenas, it is advisable to create an environment conducive to learning about open access for all participants. Administrators, for example, may see the advantages and liabilities associated with open access in different ways than faculty responsible for teaching, research, and service. Tenured faculty may express very different ideas than those who have not yet earned tenure.
- Open access task force members discovered that a positive way to commence departmental meetings with faculty was by gathering specific open access-related questions and concerns from those faculty prior to the actual meeting. This practice was especially effective given the diverse range of faculty opinions about open access, and helped the task force prepare and then account for differences in publishing habits, venues, and formats. For example, the open access related concerns of faculty in some science disciplines were found to be different from faculty in the humanities. In addition, faculty who primarily publish scholarly articles may present very different comments from those who serve as editors of academic journals. Faculty will more often than not speak from their particular disciplinary perspective and will express opinions or have questions from those positions. They may ask how an open access policy at their institution will impact the following areas: academic freedom, copyright, peer review processes, rights management issues, the need for a mediated approach to posting their work, time and effort to participate in the policy, and how to opt out of the policy. Other questions may arise that reflect values or concerns endemic to specific campus locations. The point is that the task force members should anticipate very robust discussions with faculty and administrative colleagues concerning nearly every imaginable aspect of open access (and misperceptions) and how policy requirements may be manifested in a particular campus environment.
- While no single approach can be reproduced in every location, the actual mechanics of participation in an open access policy needs to be kept as simple as possible for faculty. Details of the policy should allow, for example, for a fully staff-mediated submission process for faculty and robust assistance to those wishing to participate (retaining rights, sending in their papers to the university, or opting out). At KU, for instance, with an institutional repository, efforts were made to adjust the support given to faculty in the submission process. After KU’s institutional repository was established in 2005, faculty were originally required to submit work on their own, although assistance (and training) was provided, and help with issues related to copyright retention was freely offered. Library administrators quickly realized that their role as catalyst in the open access initiative required a significant shift in the service model it had been providing.

Conclusion:

Creating and passing an open access policy at the University of Kansas involved significant efforts on the parts of numerous individuals over more than a decade. Achieving reasonable levels of consensus across such a diverse faculty required diplomacy, patience, and careful crafting of messages to faculty and administrators. Much of the early history of the process involved educating important sectors of the campus about issues that continue to challenge faculty and administration in higher education: expanding amounts of knowledge, shrinking budgets, and emerging technological modes of discovery and delivery of scholarly information. As the campus conversations progressed, the identification and positioning of well-informed and interested faculty and administrators on campus in positions of leadership and influence was critical to the passage of an open access policy. Taking advantage of the unique strengths of the campus environment led to KU’s success: the support of faculty governance leaders and administrators who became convinced of the benefits of open access; well-nurtured relationships between faculty and librarians; and behind-the-scenes library administrative support were all critical. The “academic village” was fully engaged.

It is the authors’ wish that the experience gained at KU will provide some insights and useful suggestions to those pondering such discussions about open access policy creation. Although KU’s process took a full decade, other universities are now finding a blazed path forward, allowing significant progress in shorter time spans. It is our hope that this work eventually becomes part of a body of literature that analyzes the growth of the open access movement on university campuses world-wide.

References:

-
- ⁱ Shulenburger, D. (1998), "Moving with dispatch to resolve the scholarly communication crisis: From here to NEAR", Association of Research Libraries Proceedings of the 133rd Membership Meeting ARL Washington, DC, available at: <http://www.arl.org/arl/proceedings/133/shulenburger.html> (accessed September 18, 2006).
- ⁱⁱ Case, Mary M. (2000), "Principles for emerging systems of scholarly publishing", for the Association of Research Libraries. available at: <http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/principles.pdf> (accessed November 3, 2010).
- ⁱⁱⁱ Association of Research Libraries (2000), Tempe Principles for emerging systems of scholarly publishing". Available at, <http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/tempe/index.shtml> . (accessed November 3, 2010)]
- ^{iv} Mercer, H. E. A., Rosenblum, B., & Emmett, A. (2007). A multifaceted approach to promote a university repository: the University of Kansas' experience, *OCLC Systems & Services*, 23(2). Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/1808/1625>, (accessed on November 3, 2010).
- ^v Suber, P. (2005), "More on the Kansas OA policy", available at: http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2005_04_03_fosblogarchive.html (accessed September 10, 2006).
- ^{vi} Mercer, H., Rosenblum, B., & Emmett, A. (2007). A multifaceted approach to promote a university repository: the University of Kansas' experience, *OCLC Systems & Services*, 23(2). Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/1808/1625>, (accessed on November 3, 2010).
- ^{vii} Mercer, H., Rosenblum, B., & Emmett, A. (2007). A multifaceted approach to promote a university repository: the University of Kansas' experience, *OCLC Systems & Services*, 23(2).
- ^{viii} Harnad, S. (2006), "Maximizing Research Impact Through Institutional and National Open-Access Self-Archiving Mandates", Proceedings CRIS2006. Current 16 Research Information Systems: Open Access Institutional Repositories Bergen, Norway, available at: <http://cogprints.org/4787/> (accessed 10 September 2006).
- ^{ix} National Institute of Health (2008). "Analysis of Comments and Implementation of the NIH Public Access Policy," available at: http://publicaccess.nih.gov/analysis_of_comments_nih_public_access_policy.pdf (accessed October 25, 2010).
- ^x Thanh Nguyen et al., *Open Doors and Open Minds: What Faculty Authors Can do to Ensure Open Access to Their Work Through Their Institution*, A SPARC/Science Commons White Paper (April 2008), http://sciencecommons.org/wp-content/uploads/opendoors_v1.pdf (accessed February 5, 2009).
- ^{xi} Willinsky, John "Open Access to Knowledge: What Comes of the Right to Know in Kansas and Kumasi," at the University of Kansas, February 19, 2009. Full video presentation available, <http://hdl.handle.net/1808/4448> (accessed on November 3, 2010).

^{xii} Willinsky, John “Open Access Policies and Practices for Increasing Scholarly Contributions”. Presentation given at the University of Kansas, February 19, 2009. Full video presentation available, <http://hdl.handle.net/1808/4447> (accessed on November 3, 2010).

^{xiii} Rosenblum, Brian. “Academic Libraries and Open Access: Policies, Services and Resources for Increasing Access to Scholarship.” Presented at the National University of Kyiv Mohyla Academy, University Libraries. (Kyiv, Ukraine, May 25, 2010.) Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/1808/6392>

^{xiv} Krista D. Schmidt, Pongracz, Sennyey, and Timothy V. Carstens, "New Roles for a Changing Environment: Implications of Open Access for Libraries," *College & Research Libraries* 66, no. 5 (2005): 408-409.

Appendix A. Policy that passed the Faculty Senate on April 30, 2009

The faculty of the University of Kansas (KU) is committed to sharing the intellectual fruits of its research and scholarship as widely as possible and lowering barriers to its access. In recognition of that commitment and responsibility, the KU faculty is determined to take advantage of new technologies to increase access to its work by the citizens of Kansas and scholars, educators, and policymakers worldwide. In support of greater openness in scholarly endeavors, the KU faculty agrees to the following concept:

Each faculty member grants to KU permission to make scholarly articles to which he or she made substantial intellectual contributions publicly available in the KU open access institutional repository, and to exercise the copyright in those articles. In legal terms, the permission granted by each faculty member is a nonexclusive, irrevocable, paid-up, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same, provided that the articles are not sold for a profit. This license in no way interferes with the rights of the KU faculty author as the copyright holder of the work. The policy will apply to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while a faculty member of KU. Faculty will be afforded an opt out opportunity. Faculty governance in consultation with the Provost's office will develop the details of the policy which will be submitted for approval by the faculty senate.

Revised Policy that passed the Faculty Senate on February 11, 2010:^{xv}

The faculty of the University of Kansas (KU) is committed to sharing the intellectual fruits of its research and scholarship as widely as possible and lowering barriers to its access. In recognition of that commitment and responsibility, the KU faculty is determined to take advantage of new technologies to increase access to its work by the citizens of Kansas and scholars, educators, and policymakers worldwide. In support of greater openness in scholarly endeavors, the KU faculty agrees to the following:

Each faculty member grants to KU permission to make scholarly peer-reviewed journal articles to which he or she made substantial intellectual contributions publicly available in the KU open access

institutional repository, and to exercise the copyright in those articles. In legal terms, the permission granted by each faculty member is a nonexclusive, irrevocable, paid-up, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same, provided that the articles are not sold for a profit. This license in no way irrevocably interferes with the rights of the KU faculty author as the copyright holder of the work.

The policy will apply to all scholarly peer-reviewed journal articles authored or co-authored while a faculty member of KU. To assist in the open distribution of the articles, faculty members will provide bibliographic information and an electronic copy of each article within 30 days of publication to the Provost's Designate. The license granted to KU regarding an article will be waived by the Provost's Designate at the sole discretion of the faculty member upon written/electronic notification. The Provost's office will be responsible for interpreting this policy, resolving disputes concerning its application, and recommending changes as necessary. This policy will be reviewed by Faculty Governance, in concert with the Provost's office, every three years, and a report presented to Faculty Governance. A broadly representative Open Access Advisory Board made up of faculty, representatives from faculty governance, and the Provost's office will provide additional guidance and oversight in policy implementation.

Appendix B. Charge: The Open Access Implementation Details Task Force, 9/1/09

The Open Access policy was approved by the University of Kansas Faculty Senate on April 30, 2009. The responsibility of the Open Access Task Force will be to describe additional policy details for approval by the Faculty Senate and to outline initial steps for implementation of these policy details. A document will be drafted that will be shaped by extensive conversations with faculty and administrative groups, providing wide opportunity for comment, consultation, and deliberation by members of the KU community.

The Task Force, made up of faculty, administrators, and governance leaders, will submit to Faculty Executive committee (Face) a draft document that offers necessary refinements to the current Open Access policy. Policy refinements will be voted on by faculty governance, while additional details will be offered regarding implementation and processes to inform the senate and faculty.

The Task Force will present the results of its work to FacEx no later than the first meeting in January for its review.

This document will be submitted to the Faculty Senate during the 2009-2010 academic year for review and a final vote of approval and will:

- Clearly distinguish between what are policy issues for governance to vote on, versus what are details of procedures that will guide the policy implementation process.
- Offer adjustments to the current policy that will, in succinct language:
- Describe the opportunity granted to the faculty to request a waiver from the policy, i.e., the “opt out” clause, describing succinctly the procedures and conditions, if any, necessary for faculty to be granted the waiver.
- Indicate the future regular review of the policy by Face and KU administrators.

Toward Open Access: It Takes a “Village”

- Provide a statement in the policy indicating the means by which faculty will supply copies of relevant publications to the University.
 - Develop an implementation plan and describe procedures for application of the policy, details of which will include:
 - Describe the time frame by which the phases of implementation will occur. This can be a brief but succinct description.
 - Description of mechanisms for achieving widest level of participation as possible, e.g., set goals to approach full voluntary participation on an incremental basis.
-

This timeline was to be added to the chapter/article published by Taylor & Francis as a “box” inserted around the article. Emmett, A; Stratton, J; Peterson, A.T; Church-Duran, J; & Lorraine Haricombe. (Accepted for publication December 2010), expected publication in Summer 2011, *Toward Open Access: it takes a village*. In *Library Administration*, published by Taylor and Francis. (Later to be published as chapter in monograph.)

Open Access Timeline of Events at KU for “It Takes A Village” Book Chapter:

October, 1998: KU’s then-Provost David Shulenburg gives his talk, *Moving with Dispatch to Resolve the Scholarly Communication Crisis: From Here to NEAR*, at the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Membership Meeting in Washington D.C.

November, 2000: Shulenburg hosts the first of his Provost’s Seminars, *From Crisis to Reform: Scholarly Communication and the Tempe Principles*.

March, 2005: Shulenburg hosts the second of his Provost’s Seminars, *The Changing Landscape of Scholarly Communication: The Role of Digital Repositories*.

March, 2005: KU became the first member of the American Association of Universities (AAU) to pass a resolution to encourage self-archiving by its faculty (Suber, 2005)ⁱ, titled “Resolution on Access to Scholarly Information”.

2005: KU went live with its institutional repository, KU ScholarWorks (built on DSpace).

October, 2006: KU Medical Center (KUMC) campus sponsored the *Mass and Matter: Public Access to Scientific Information* conference.

November, 2007: KU launched its hosted journal publications using Open Journal Systems.

March, 2008: KU Libraries sponsor *Copyright and Academia: Challenges and Opportunities*, with national speakers.

September, 2008: University Faculty Research Committee’s *ad hoc* committee was formed and its charge approved by Faculty Senate.

October, 2008 through April 2009: *Ad hoc* committee designs and distributes a faculty survey, holds two open meetings and responds to numerous individual and departmental communiqués.

February, 2009: John Willinsky from Stanford lead a Globalization Seminar at KU entitled *Open Access to Knowledge: What Comes of the Right to Know in Kansas and Kumasai*.

April, 2009: Faculty Senate approval of KU’s first Open Access policy requiring the charging of an implementation task force.

June, 2009: Open Access Implementation Task Force is formed and charged.

July, 2009 through February 2010: Open Access Implementation Task force meets with over 230 faculty groups, in more than 20 departmental and open campus meetings.

February, 2010: Faculty Senate approves the revised Open Access policy and endorses implementation plan.

This timeline was to be added to the chapter/article published by Taylor & Francis as a “box” inserted around the article. Emmett, A; Stratton, J; Peterson, A.T; Church-Duran, J; & Lorraine Haricombe. (Accepted for publication December 2010), expected publication in Summer 2011, *Toward Open Access: it takes a village*. In *Library Administration*, published by Taylor and Francis. (Later to be published as chapter in monograph.)

June 2010, 2010: KU Interim Provost Anderson accepts and approves the policy, and charges KU libraries with implementation of the Open Access policy.

ⁱ Suber, Peter. (2005), "More on the Kansas OA policy", available at: http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2005_04_03_fosblogarchive.html (accessed September 10, 2006).